



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,325	08/29/2003	William Joseph Butsch	9350	1633

27752 7590 10/12/2007  
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION - WEST BLDG.  
WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 412  
6250 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER
----------

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/12/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/652,325

Applicant(s)

BUTSCH ET AL.

Examiner

Clark F. Dexter

Art Unit

3724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Peter Meyer.

(3) Mr. Clark Dexter.

(2) Mr. Kevin McNeil.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 05 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 (generally).

Identification of prior art discussed: McNeil, pn 4,919,351 (hereafter McNeil '351).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Clark F. Dexter  
Primary Examiner



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. McNeil was invited to this telephonic interview by Mr. Meyer for his technical expertise because Mr. McNeil is the inventor of the applied base reference and the declarant in the declaration filed on June 6, 2007.

Applicant's position is that McNeil '351 does not teach or suggest an apparatus as claimed (e.g., in claim 1) wherein the bedroll rotates at a first blade pass frequency, the chop off roll rotates at a second blade pass frequency, and wherein the second blade pass frequency is distinct from the first blade pass frequency. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's position and again cited McNeil '351, wherein in column 5, lines 32-38 it is disclosed that the carrier 26 rotates at twice the angular rate of the bedroll 21, and that the roll 23 rotates at 3 times the rate of the bedroll 21. Thus, the Examiner's position is that these functions disclosed by McNeil '351 meet the subject limitation. The Examiner further noted that in Mr. McNeil's declaration, it is stated that "a key aspect of this invention is that both sets of blades remain parallel during engagement and also remain at matched circumferential speeds while in mesh," (emphasis added) and that the claims do not set forth any limitations with respect to the circumferential speeds of the blades. Applicant stated that these matters would be further considered.